

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-47 are pending. All claims are original. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be forwarded along to issuance.

**Finality**

The current action is made final. The Office asserts "Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action." *Office Action dated 5/13/2005 p. 8*. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant has made no amendments to the claims. Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action based upon the asserted ground.

**Mi et al Reference**

The Office cites and comments upon U.S. Patent No. 6,418,472 to Mi et al. (hereinafter "Mi"). *Office Action dated 5/13/2005 p. 8*. The Office does not rely upon Mi to make any specific rejection of any claim. MPEP § 706 refers to C.F.R. 1.104 which describes the required specificity of claim rejections in the following excerpt:

In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified. 37 C.F.R. 1.104(c)(2).

1 Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's explain with  
2 specificity the pertinence of each reference.

3  
4  **§§ 102(b) Rejection**

5 Claims 1-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated  
6 by U.S. Patent No. 5,678,041 to Baker et al. (hereinafter "Baker"). The Applicant  
7 respectfully disagrees.

8 Baker describes a system and method for restricting user access rights on  
9 the Internet based on rating information stored in a relational database. Baker  
10 describes that "there exists no simple means for an authority (i.e., teacher,  
11 supervisor, system administrator, etc.) to selectively control WWW access by one  
12 or more users without significantly impairing the users ability to communicate  
13 with the Internet." *See Baker, Col. 2, Line 66 to Col. 3, Line 3.* To provide this  
14 control, Baker describes a rating system "that allows one or more network  
15 administrators/managers to rate particular information and/or services", the rating  
16 is utilized "to restrict specific system users from accessing the information/service  
17 via certain public or otherwise uncontrolled databases". *See Baker, Col. 3, Lines*  
18 *11-14.* Baker then describes a "relational database [which] is arranged so that for  
19 each user of the system a request for a particular resource will only be passed on  
20 from the local network to a server providing a link to the public/uncontrolled  
21 database if the resource identifier has an access rating for which the user has been  
22 assigned specific permissions by an administrator/manager". *See Baker, Col. 3,*  
23 *Lines 21-29.* Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest an association between  
24 users, or selectively providing information about the association.

1       **Claim 1** recites a method which includes "associating a first entity with a  
2 second entity in a first device" and "selectively providing information about the  
3 association of the first and second entities to a second device as directed by the  
4 first entity, without requiring the second entity to be operatively associated with  
5 either the first or second device".

6       In the previous response (Response filed 1/24/2005), Applicant respectfully  
7 requested clarification of rejections which the Applicant asserted were unclear.  
8 Applicant respectfully maintains that it is unclear which portions of Baker the  
9 examiner is relying upon as a basis for the features recited in claim 1. As the  
10 Examiner is aware, "[w]here a major technical rejection is proper, it should be  
11 stated with a full development of reasons rather than by a mere conclusion coupled  
12 with some stereotyped expression." MPEP. §707.07(g). Further, MPEP § 706  
13 refers to C.F.R § 1.104 which describes the required specificity of claim rejections  
14 in the following excerpt:

15               In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the  
16 examiner must cite the best references at his or her command.  
17 When a reference is complex or shows or describes  
18 inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the  
19 particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as  
practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent,  
must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.  
37 C.F.R. 1.104(c)(2).

20 Here, the Office Action is almost entirely composed of direct claim language  
21 coupled with bare, unexplained references to and excerpts from Baker. No  
22 particular explanation of Baker is offered. For example, it is entirely unclear what  
23 the Office is asserting for, a first entity, a second entity, or for an association  
24 between first and second entities. Accordingly, as is addressed in detail in the  
25

1 following remarks, Applicant asserts that a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not  
2 been established and that the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

3 The Office first asserts that the "associating" as recited above is described  
4 in Baker at column 3, lines 60-65, the portion of which is excerpted as follows:

5 As shown in FIG. 1, the system includes public network 100,  
6 network resources 101-105, and user site 106. Particular users  
7 at user site 106 gain access to public network 100 via user  
8 terminals 107, 108 and 109. Each of these user terminals is  
9 linked by local area network ("LAN") 110 to processor 111  
10 within proxy server 112. *Baker, Col. 3, Lines 60-65.*

11 As shown in the above referenced portion, Baker merely describes user terminals  
12 linked by a local area network. The office makes no indication of what in the  
13 above recited portion is relied upon for the features of claim 1.

14 In response to Applicant's previous remarks (Response filed 1/24/2005),  
15 the Office further asserts Baker column 4, lines 1-16, (Office Action dated  
16 5/13/2005 p. 6-7) the portion of which is excerpted as follows:

17 Requests from user terminals 107-109 for access to network  
18 resources (101-105) through public network 100 are  
19 submitted to processor 111 within proxy server 112. In this  
20 particular embodiment of the invention, the submitted  
21 requests are assumed to be in the form of URLs. As is well  
22 known in art, when URLs are submitted to a proxy server, the  
23 particular requesting user terminal is identified to the proxy  
24 server by an identification header attached to the URL. For  
25 the system shown in FIG. 1, the identification code for user  
terminal 107 is ID.sub.107, the identification code for user  
terminal 108 is ID.sub.108, and the identification code for  
user terminal 109 is ID.sub.109. In addition, within the  
system of FIG. 1, URLs designated as URL.sub.101,  
URL.sub.102, URL.sub.103, URL.sub.104 and URL.sub.105,  
represent requests for information from network resources  
101, 102, 103, 104 and 105, respectively. *Baker, Col. 4,  
Lines 1-16.*

1 As shown in the above referenced portion, Barker describes requests in the form of  
2 URLs submitted to a proxy server. These URLs may be used to identify the  
3 requesting user terminal. The above referenced portion does not clarify what  
4 particular components of Baker are relied upon. Further, no attempt is made to  
5 clarify the rejection in light of the cited portion. Only the portion itself is offered.  
6 Neither the examiner nor the cited portion describes any association between  
7 entities. Applicant asserts that the cited portions of Baker provides no basis for  
8 "associating a first entity with a second entity in a first device" as recited in claim  
9 1.  
10

11 The Office next asserts that "selectively providing" as recited above is  
12 described in Baker at column 5, lines 45-65, the portion of which is excerpted as  
13 follows:  
14

15 In the particular embodiment described above, relational  
16 database 114 stores a list of user terminal identification codes  
17 and the various user clearances reflective of the ratings of  
18 network resources that each user terminal should be allowed  
19 to retrieve from public network 100. It will be understood that  
20 the invention could be modified so that the list of user  
21 clearances associated with a given user terminal identification  
22 code serves as a restrictive list (i.e.; that user is not allowed to  
23 retrieve network resources having that rating). This restrictive  
24 listing functionality could be readily facilitated by  
25 reprogramming processor 111. In addition, the invention  
could be modified so that the identification codes recognized  
by processor 111 and stored in relational database 114 are  
user specific, as opposed to user terminal specific. In other  
words, the system of FIG. 1 could be modified so that a given  
individual using a terminal is identified to the system by a  
personal password or other identifying code. Access or denial  
of the transmission of particular URLs is effected by the  
system as a function of that person's identity, regardless of the  
particular user terminal they may be utilizing. *Baker, Col. 5,  
Lines 45-65.*

1 As show in the above referenced portion, Baker merely describes using user  
2 specific identification codes so that access or denial of a transmission from a  
3 particular URL is a function of that user's identity. It is respectfully submitted  
4 that the Office has misinterpreted the language of Claim 1.

5 In response to Applicant's previous remarks (Response filed 1/24/2005),  
6 the Office further asserts Baker column 4, lines 7-35, (Office Action dated  
7 5/13/2005 p. 7) the portion of which is excerpted as follows:

8 Upon receipt of an incoming URL, processor 111 is  
9 programmed to determine the identity of the requesting user  
10 terminal from the URL header. This identification  
11 information is then utilized by processor 111 to cross-  
12 reference the received URL with information stored in  
13 relational database 114. Relational database 114 contains  
14 listing 115 which associates each of the user identification  
15 codes (ID.sub.107, ID.sub.108 and ID.sub.109) with a user  
16 clearance code (user clearances.sub.107, user  
17 clearances.sub.108 and user clearances.sub.109, respectively).  
18 These user clearances indicate the particular rating class or  
19 classes of network resources that a given user terminal is  
20 allowed to access (i.e.; unlimited access; restricted use of  
21 URLs identified as accessing violent subject matter; restricted  
22 use of URLs that are identified as accessing obscene subject  
23 matter; etc). Also contained in relational database 114 is  
24 listing 116 which includes a register of allowable URLs  
25 (URL.sub.101-105) that may be transmitted from a user  
terminal to access network resources. *Baker, Col. 4, Lines 17-35.*

19 As shown in the above referenced portion, Barker describes that processor 111  
20 identifies the requesting user terminal. This user terminal id may be used to cross-  
21 reference the URL with database information. Baker merely uses a URL request to  
22 cross reference the requesting user terminal with the particular clearance code for  
23 that user terminal. Each user id and clearance id are associated with a particular  
24 user terminal. Baker does not disclose an association of or selectively providing  
25 information about an association of user terminals. Again, the above referenced

1 portion does not clarify what particular components of Baker the examiner is  
2 relying upon. Further, no attempt is made to clarify the rejection in light of the  
3 cited portion. Applicant asserts that the cited portions of Baker provide no basis  
4 for "selectively providing information about the association of the first and second  
5 entities to a second device" as recited in claim 1.

6 Further, Baker fails to describe "providing information about the  
7 association of a first and second entity to a second device as directed by the first  
8 entity" or "without requiring the second entity to be operatively associated  
9 with either the first or second device" which are additional recited features of  
10 claim 1. The Office relies upon the passages excerpted above for these additional  
11 features of claim 1. Baker does not disclose these recited features in the portions  
12 cited by the examiner, or elsewhere.

13 To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.  
14 *MPEP* § 2131. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth  
15 in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art  
16 reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2  
17 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, Baker fails to disclose each and  
18 every claim limitation. Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest "associating a  
19 first entity with a second entity in a first device" as recited in Claim 1. Rather, the  
20 referenced portions of Baker merely describe user terminals linked by a local area  
21 network. Further, Barker does not disclose, teach or suggest "selectively providing  
22 information about the association of the first and second entities" as recited in  
23 Claim 1. Baker fails to even mention information about an association in the  
24 portions relied upon by the Examiner, nor elsewhere in the asserted reference.  
25 Baker further fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "providing information about the

1 association of a first and second entity to a second device as directed by the first  
2 entity" or "without requiring the second entity to be operatively associated  
3 with either the first or second device". Therefore, it is respectfully submitted  
4 that a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established, and withdrawal of  
5 the §102 rejection is respectfully requested.

6 Claims 2-11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are  
7 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also  
8 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited  
9 in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either  
10 singly or in combination with one another.

11 Claim 9, for example, recites "wherein the first entity is a parent/guardian  
12 of the second entity", which is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Baker. The  
13 Office asserts that the one or more network administrators/managers are the  
14 "parent guardian". This is not the case and is inconsistent with the previous  
15 assertions made by the Office. For example, if the first entity is the network  
16 administrator, there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Baker for  
17 information about the association of the network administrator with another entity.  
18 In response to Applicant's previous remarks (Response filed 1/24/2005), the  
19 Office further asserts Baker column 5, lines 36-40, (*Office Action dated 5/13/2005*  
20 *p. 8*) the portion of which is excerpted as follows:

21  
22 Processor 111 could also be programmed to deny all requests  
23 from user terminals for un-rated resources. This would  
24 prohibit the accessing of network resources that had not been  
25 reviewed or rated by the system administrator/manager.  
*Baker, Col. 5, Lines 36-40.*



1 The recited passage simply indicates that all requests for unrated resource may be  
2 denied. Respectfully, nothing in the recited passage discloses "wherein the first  
3 entity is a parent/guardian of the second entity" as recited in claim 9.

4 **Claim 12** recites a computer-readable medium which includes "associating  
5 a first entity with a second entity in a first device" and "causing the first device to  
6 selectively provide information about the association of the first and second  
7 entities to a second device as directed by the first entity, without requiring the  
8 second entity to be operatively associated with either the first or second device".  
9 Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest these aspects.

10 As described in relation to Claim 1, Baker does not disclose, teach or  
11 suggest "information about the association of the first and second entities".  
12 Rather, Baker merely describes a separate user clearance for each user terminal  
13 which is utilized to determine whether the user terminal is permitted to access  
14 information from a database based a resource rating. Accordingly, withdrawal of  
15 the rejection with respect to Claim 12 is respectfully requested.

16 **Claims 13-22** depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 12 and are  
17 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also  
18 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited  
19 in claim 12, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either  
20 singly or in combination with one another.

21 **Claim 23** recites an apparatus having "memory having information  
22 associating a first user of the apparatus with a second user of the apparatus" and  
23 "logic operatively coupled to the memory and configured to respond to inputs  
24 from the first user by selectively outputting the information about the association  
25 of the first user and the second user, without requiring the second user to be

1 operatively signed-in to the apparatus". Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest  
2 these aspects.

3 As described in relation to Claims 1 and 12, Baker does not disclose, teach  
4 or suggest "information about the association of the first and second entities".  
5 Rather, Baker merely describes a separate user clearance for each user terminal  
6 which is utilized to determine whether the user terminal is permitted to access  
7 information from a database based a resource rating. Accordingly, withdrawal of  
8 the rejection with respect to Claim 23 is respectfully requested.

9 Claims 24-31 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 23 and are  
10 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also  
11 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited  
12 in claim 23, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either  
13 singly or in combination with one another.

14 Claim 32 recites "a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data  
15 structure, comprising: a validation code that identifies a first entity and a second  
16 entity." Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest these aspects. The Office  
17 asserts that Claim 32 has "limitations that is similar to those of claim 1, thus they  
18 are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above". *Office Action*  
19 *Dated October 6, 2004, Page 4.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees. However,  
20 following this assertion, the Applicant submits that Claim 32 is allowable based on  
21 the reasoning offered in respect to Claim 1. Additionally, Claim 32 is also  
22 allowable based on the recitation of "a validation code that identifies a first entity  
23 and a second entity", which is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Baker. In  
24 response to Applicant's previous remarks (Response filed 1/24/2005), the Office  
25

1 further asserts Baker column 4, lines 17-25, (*Office Action dated 5/13/2005 p. 8*)  
2 the portion of which is excerpted as follows:

3  
4 Upon receipt of an incoming URL, processor 111 is  
5 programmed to determine the identity of the requesting user  
6 terminal from the URL header. This identification  
7 information is then utilized by processor 111 to cross-  
8 reference the received URL with information stored in  
9 relational database 114. Relational database 114 contains  
10 listing 115 which associates each of the user identification  
11 codes (ID.sub.107, ID.sub.108 and ID.sub.109) with a user  
12 clearance code (user clearances.sub.107, user  
13 clearances.sub.108 and user clearances.sub.109, respectively).  
14 *Baker, Col. 4, Lines 17-25.*

15 The recited passage indicates identification of a requesting terminal and further  
16 that a listing associates each particular user id with a particular clearance code  
17 respectively. The codes and ids are matched one to one. The passage does not  
18 show "a validation code that identifies a first and a second entity. Respectfully,  
19 nothing in the recited passage discloses the recited features of claim 32.

20 Claims 33-36 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 32 and are  
21 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also  
22 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited  
23 in claim 32, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either  
24 singly or in combination with one another.

25 Claim 37 recites an apparatus having "memory" and "logic operatively  
coupled to the memory and configured to allow a first entity to be operatively  
associated with the apparatus, and receive information about an association of the  
first entity and at least one other entity, without requiring the at least one other  
entity to be operatively associated with the apparatus". Baker does not disclose,  
teach or suggest these features.

As described in relation to Claims 1, 12 and 23, Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest "information about an association". Rather, Baker merely describes a separate user clearance for each user terminal which is utilized to determine whether the user terminal is permitted to access information from a database based a resource rating. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claim 37 is respectfully requested.

Claims 38-47 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 37 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 37, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

### Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 6/7/5

By: 

William J. Breen III  
Reg. No. 45,313  
(509) 324-9256 x249